

### REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed May 26, 2006. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 2-16 were pending in this Application. Claim 1 was previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2-16 were rejected. Claims 5, 7, and 13 have been amended to further define various features of Applicants' invention. Claim 6 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 2-10, and 16 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,650,906 issued to Rainer Marquardt et al. ("Marquardt").

With respect to the rejection of independent claim 5, Applicant has amended to recite that the free wheeling device voltage is fed back between the output terminal and a control input of an amplifier stage of a gate driver connected to a control terminal of one of the semiconductor power switches. Applicants submit that Marquardt does not disclose a circuit that anticipates the implementation recited in claim 5 as amended. If Marquardt contains an element that is analogous to the amplifier stage recited in claim 5 as amended, it is Marquardt's drive device 6 as the Examiner acknowledges in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action.

Thus, Marquardt cannot anticipate claim 5 as amended absent a feed back path from Marquardt's output terminal to a common input of a push-pull stage of Marquardt's driver 6. Marquardt, however, does not show such a feed back path. It is unambiguously apparent from FIG 2 and FIG 3 that there is no feedback path to the unnumbered node of Marquardt that provides the common input to Marquardt's transistors 32 and 34.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, "the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is

contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co. Ltd.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Because the cited reference does not anticipate claim 5 as amended, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the anticipation rejection. Analogous amendments have been made to independent claims 7 and 13 and analogous comments apply. Independent claim 6 has been cancelled.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Applicants submit that the Section 103(a) rejections of claims 11-15 are moot in view of the amendments to independent claims 7 and 13 because the cited references do not teach or suggest the feedback paths recited in those claims as argued above in response to the anticipation rejections.


**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicants believe there are no further fees due at this time; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2680.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorney for Applicants



Joseph Lally  
Reg. No. 38,947

Date: August 25, 2006

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **31625**  
512.322.2680  
512.322.8383 (fax)